THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal cause for 1 2 sentencing, United States versus Michael Young, docket number 3 16-CR-617. 4 Counsel, state your appearances starting with the 5 government. 6 MR. SPEKTOR: Good morning, Your Honor, Andrey 7 Spektor and Lindsay Gerdes for the United States. 8 THE COURT: Good morning. 9 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Kristen 10 McKeown, Probation. 11 THE COURT: Good morning. 12 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Hi, good morning, Mitchell 13 Dinnerstein, D-I-N-N-E-R-S-T-E-I-N for Mr. Young, who is 14 before the Court. 1.5 THE COURT: Good morning. Good morning, Mr. Young. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning. 17 THE COURT: We're on for sentencing. Let me first 18 determine if I'm going to accept the guilty plea that 19 Mr. Young gave to Magistrate Judge Orenstein. 20 I have reviewed the transcript of that plea. 21 Mr. Young, is it still your desire to plead guilty? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes. 23 THE COURT: Is everything that you told the 24 magistrate judge on that date true? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Dinnerstein, do you know of any reason why I should not accept the guilty plea?

MR. DINNERSTEIN: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Having heard counsel and the defendant's answers to my questions and having reviewed the transcript of the plea, I find the defendant is pleading guilty knowingly and voluntarily and understands his rights and the consequences of his plea and that there is a factual basis for the plea. I, therefore, accept the plea of guilty.

Let me go through with you, Mr. Young, the documents I have reviewed in preparing for the sentencing. I believe you have seen all of these but if you haven't let me know and we'll take a break so you can go over them with your attorney, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I will start with the Presentence
Investigation Report that's from September 18th of this year.
There was one addendum to that report that is curiously
undated but came in fairly recently. In addition to that, I
have a sentencing memorandum from Mr. Dinnerstein with
exhibits annexed to it, that is also undated but received in
my chambers on November 27th. I have a follow-up letter from
Mr. Dinnerstein of November 29th clarifying some things about
the plea agreement and the guideline range and then I have a
sentencing memorandum from the government that's dated

November 30th. 1 2. Anything else I need to be looking at? I have 3 Mr. Young's letter, of course it's exhibited to the sentencing 4 memorandum. 5 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your Honor, I would just say that the original sentencing memorandum is dated for me 6 7 November 21st. That's on the second page. 8 THE COURT: You are correct, my apologies. 9 MR. DINNERSTEIN: That's okay. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Young, you're familiar with all 11 those documents? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Let's talk next about the facts that are 14 going to control this sentencing. Based on the parties' 15 submissions, I don't think there's any dispute about the 16 description of the offense and the offender characteristics in 17 the PSR; is that correct? 18 That's correct, Your Honor. MR. SPEKTOR: 19 MR. DINNERSTEIN: That's right, Judge. 20 THE COURT: I will adopt those portions of Section A 21 and C that describe the offense and the offender 22 characteristics as my findings of fact for purposes of the 23 sentencing. 24 Let's next talk about the guidelines, which are of

course merely advisory and only one factor that I am to

2.

I'm a little bit confused as to the parties' positions on the guidelines. Let me summarize what I understand and then you all tell me if I'm wrong.

I think there is agreement that we're talking about an offense level of 28 and a Criminal History Category of VI, which would make Mr. Young a career offender and that would give a guideline range of 140 to 175. I think technically the parties agree that's the way the guidelines work out. But as I understand it, they have also jointly said to me that's too high, you should not consider that to be the guidelines. You should be looking more in the 77 to 96 month range as a guideline range for an appropriate sentence here.

Have I said it correctly?

MR. SPEKTOR: I think that's essentially right,

Judge. The one, I guess, technical correction is because he's
a career offender he started at base offense level 32 and then
we get to 28. And, again, because he's a career offender

Criminal History VI applies, but again we all agree that both
the criminal history and the base offense level are overstated
and we're jointly asking for a 76 to 96 month range to apply.

THE COURT: That's fine. But there is a document I have to fill out when I do the judgment that you all don't see called the Statement of Reasons and the statement has to have the calculation of the guideline range. I have no problem

with the parties' agreement to 77 to 96 as the starting point for me to determine the sentence, that's fine, but technically, as a technical matter, I do think we're talking about an adjusted offense level of 28, right?

MR. SPEKTOR: That's right.

2.

offender kicks it up to Category VI, which means 140 to 175 months. So that's what I put on the form because that is technically correct, that's my finding as to the guidelines. I accept the parties' mutually expressed view that that's much too high and I shouldn't be considering that range. It seems much too high to me too and that the appropriate range for me to be considering is 77 to 96, which leaves only one ambiguity, which is under your plea agreement, what I'm picking up from Mr. Dinnerstein is he's looking for a downward variance. Is that the case and, if it is the case, is it allowed under the plea agreement?

MR. SPEKTOR: It's not allowed under the plea agreement. I think the plea agreement says that we're jointly asking for a range between 76 and 96 months.

The way I read Mr. Dinnerstein's letter is that it said -- and obviously the Court is not bound by our agreement which is sort of a wink and a nod to the Court, obviously he's not allowed to advocate for anything lower and we don't think anything lower is appropriate.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that a clear statement,
Mr. Dinnerstein?

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your Honor, I kind of get to where we are slightly differently. Because both of us agreed, as the Probation Department did, I believe it's 4B1.3(3) applies. So instead of him being under those circumstances where 4B1.3 applies, instead of him being a career offender or Criminal History Category VI, he should be construed going in as a Category V, because that's what we agreed to, that was part of the agreement.

Now I agree with you that it is technical because I think we still get to the same 77 to 96 months that way, but we start there and, therefore, this Court of course can take into consideration 3553(a) factors starting there instead of starting at 140 to 175. So that's why I made a point of this.

Also, it's my understanding that an individual in Category V can get a two-level reduction for a minor role in the offense, which we also both agreed to, that he should have gotten the minor role in the offense. The government's position is if he's in Category VI he can't get a two-level reduction for a minor role.

THE COURT: But I think we're kind of in angels dancing on the head of a pin land. If the technically correct guidelines are 140 to 175 months, I'm not going to mess with them in terms of what departures might be appropriate under

the guidelines. There is no reason for me to do that.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Well --

2.

THE COURT: I'm going to vary. I don't know if there's any amount of downward departure that would legitimately get me to 77 to 96, but there is legitimately a variance that I could use to do that. So that's the way I'm approaching it. I think that's the only thing that makes sense. Because like you said in your letter, well, if I start thinking did the criminal history get overstated, I can only take him down one level to Category V and I don't see anything to mess around with that when we're all agreed that the 140 to 175 is much too high and the appropriate range for me to use as a starting point is 77 to 96.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: I agree with you. I guess part of that is I'm -- I see two issues here that I just wanted to address with the Court, which I did in the papers.

One deals with the idea that the youthful offender adjudication counts for career offender purposes. This case the guy got a four-month sentencing and then because he had a violation of probation that ran concurrently with another case, it put it at 14 months and therefore counts. Which I think is just -- I'm just in a way bitching, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand. I got that. But I think you're barking up the wrong tree. Those would be good arguments if you were trying to persuade me why 140 to 175

1 months is too high. 2. MR. DINNERSTEIN: You're right. 3 THE COURT: You should weigh the guidelines lightly, Judge, because look at these mitigating factors that 4 5 contributed to them, but we know they're too high. 6 The other thing was I wanted to MR. DINNERSTEIN: 7 give you a pat on the back for your U.S.A. versus Terrence 8 Williams decision, which was a pre-Beckels decision which 9 frankly, in my opinion, makes a heck of a lot more sense than 10 what the Supreme Court did, so I just wanted to mention that. 11 THE COURT: I appreciate that. 12 In any event, I still have an open question for you 13 which is, as I understand the plea agreement, you are not 14 allowed to argue that 77 to 96 is too high and I ought to go 15 below that. You can of course remind me of the fact that 16 where I sentence him is entirely up to me. 17 I understand that to be your position, am I right? 18 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Absolutely, Judge. 19 THE COURT: So the government does not consider 20 anything that Mr. Dinnerstein has said as constituting a 21 breach of the plea agreement, right? 22 MR. SPEKTOR: That's right, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: So that's my finding on the guideline 24 and, secondarily, that's how I am generally approaching this 25 case is the 77 to 96 right, or do I on my own feel the 3553(a)

1 factors which suggest something lower. Okay, good. 2 Let me then hear from all the parties on those 3 3553(a) factors, I'll start with you, Mr. Dinnerstein. MR. DINNERSTEIN: Michael Young is now 33-years old, 4 5 his criminal history category, which we just discussed, was 6 driven by misconduct that occurred more than 10 years ago, 7 some more than 15 years ago when he was a teenager. He's not 8 that person now, but --9 THE COURT: This is a worse crime now, isn't it? 10 Isn't this a worse crime than when he was a teenager? 11 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Is it what? 12 THE COURT: Is it worse, is it more egregious? 13 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Well, I think maturity makes a 14 difference and that's what I'm talking about. The fact that 1.5 those crimes were committed when he was a teenager --16 THE COURT: But I'm asking you a different question. 17 MR. DINNERSTEIN: -- he may have outgrown. It's not 18 only about youth --19 THE COURT: I'm asking you, has he not graduated to 20 a higher level of criminal activity by this conviction? 21 MR. DINNERSTEIN: I understand what you're saying, 22 Your Honor, and I think that's not the case. I think what 23 this is is a person who has a drug problem, had a drug 24 problem. Who is a small-time drug dealer in the community 25 that he lives in. There's nothing to defend that, but that's

what this case is about.

The government has acknowledged that he was a minor role player in this and that is also of course of significance.

Now just I believe this week Your Honor sentenced Mr. Carrillo to 126 months and that there was a forfeiture order that was for \$150,000 plus numerous guns that were apparently recovered in his apartment, I don't know exactly where they were recovered.

THE COURT: If you're making the point that

Mr. Young compares favorably with Mr. Carrillo, I agree with
you.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Right. Michael's forfeiture order is \$1440, which is less than 100th of that.

There is also clearly no accusation that he ever acted violently, I think that's also a positive factor in terms of response to your question whether he's graduating upwards.

I want to talk a little bit about what the government said in its memo that acknowledges the Queensbridge as the largest public housing complex in the country. In fact, it has 29 buildings, it has 96 units per building, has over 7,000 people, and in 1939 when it was built there was a policy that poor people and only poor people should live there. Also, it happened that more than 98 percent of the

people were either black or Latino who lived there. That's hardly a good thing.

Today, in a more enlightened world dealing with housing policy, these huge housing projects first aren't built and certainly the idea of segregating poor people has been determined to be a bad idea. It is a much better idea since the housing policy today that rich people, poor people, middle class people all live together, it creates a sense of community and that's really a good thing.

Where Queensbridge is and -- now it's actually better but in the '90s and in the 2000s when Michael was growing up, it was a very dangerous place. And, hopefully, today housing projects in these sorts of places are run better. In fact, we know, based on crime statistics, that crime is down and that we hope that the residents who live here, who live in those places have hope that they can actually get beyond it. So we hope and I hope that Queensbridge is anachronism of the past and it was a bad and ineffective housing policy.

Now Michael grew up in that project and as a teenager he lived a street life. He got involved in drugs. His father, who is not around, when he was around was abusive towards him. In school he did not -- was not a good student. He was in Special Ed. classes. He was immature and he was involved with what occurred on the streets in the '90s and the

2.

2000s. That's in fact the reason why what drives this case is his criminal activity back 10, 15 years ago. Maybe he saw, and it wouldn't be surprising, that there was little hope for him of having a really good life. He wound up committing those crimes and he wound up going to jail back then.

Now I looked up a little bit about Queensbridge and back then all the people who have, quote, made it in Queensbridge, they're not educators, they're not people who did well in school. There's two types of people who made it, apparently. People who are rappers, who are involved in the music industry and people who play basketball. There are several basketball players who are now in the NBA who grew up in Queensbridge. That takes a particular talent that Michael did not have, and I think that's a factor.

But I also think he's now 33, he's not 20 and he's grown up and it's not the person that he is today who in a sense is going to be sentenced because of these guidelines and because of his Criminal History Category.

His mom is here in Court, she's the woman in pink over there.

THE COURT: Thank you for coming.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: She needed an Access-A-Ride to get here, she walks with a walker. She lives in Queensbridge, she's lived there for her whole life. She has a real relationship with Michael. If you read her letter, this is

Exhibit 1, she talks about that he's a good kid, that he's been good to her and that she actually writes a second letter saying that she hopes when you sentence him, you sentence him to a place relatively close so she can get an Access-A-Ride or however she would travel and she would go visit him. It's my understanding that's how she visits him at the MDC where he's presently being housed.

She needs him, she loves him. He needs her, he loves her. That's how people get beyond criminal activity, I think, by having relationships that matter.

His girlfriend is the woman in the middle over there, she's Crystal. He has children not with her, but he cares for her children. She writes that in her letter, which I believe is Exhibit 3. I'm sure you read it.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.

1.5

MR. DINNERSTEIN: And Michael cares for those children and helps her take care of them when he was out on the street. He also has two other children and there is another letter there, it's not a letter that shows necessarily much affection towards him, but it's a recognition that they messed up in the past, her and Michael, and that she wants to get beyond that. She doesn't want it to be held against him when he's punished today, and that he's also a good father to their child. That's the criminal complaint case that was from 2013.

1 THE COURT: Yes.

1.5

MR. DINNERSTEIN: And Michael also writes to the Court. He knows he must get a handle on his drug problems and he hopes, frankly, when he goes — and I'm not asking for time served, when he goes to prison that he gets into a drug program, that the Court acknowledges a need for that, and that he also understands he needs to obtain a skill and gets some better education. Whatever his educational limitations are, he's still understands he needs to get educated.

Now I think as a teenager Michael was directionless, but he says in his letter, and I think it's quite insightful, that he has no illusions that this will not be easy. He simply now asks for a reasonable chance and reasonable time to contribute to his community, which he mentions, and to support his children.

So you have the difficult job that's I guess why they give you the robes, but what's an appropriate sentence using all the 3553(a) factors, that's for you to decide.

Carmichael, who also was a person who was described had a minor role in this offense received a 51-month sentence. That's maybe appropriate. Michael, I think, and I don't know about Carmichael, but I know that Michael now recognizes that he has responsibilities for his children, for Crystal's children and for his mother and he hopes that he'll have a chance to get out there and act responsibly and show the Court

1 that he really does want to be a decent member of our 2. community. 3 In a sense -- and I find this all troubling and, 4 frankly, I find it troubling because of how the U.S. 5 Sentencing Guidelines work, that incidents that happened long ago when a person was different still is affected in the same 6 7 way as something that happened this week or this month or this 8 That to me doesn't make sense from a sentencing 9 perspective. And the person today, this 33-year old man is 10 not that 16-year old kid or 18-year old kid who did those 11 criminal acts 15 years ago. So I ask you to take that into 12 consideration. 13 Your Honor, the government did provide a B1C plea so 14 there is no mandatory minimum in this case and it's your job 15 totally, you have absolute discretion to do justice. I ask 16 you to do that wisely. Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Dinnerstein. 18 Mr. Young, I've read your letter but if you'd like 19 to say anything or amplify on the letter or anything else you 20 want to say I'm happy to hear it. 21 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. 23 I'll hear from the government. 24 MR. SPEKTOR: Your Honor, just very briefly.

Mr. Dinnerstein talked about how Queensbridge is improving,

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and I hope that's true, but the defendant's conduct doesn't help matters in Queensbridge selling drugs. And I do recognize that, you know, if he was not a career offender he would get the benefit of the minor role adjustment. There are four defendants in this case who are similarly situated in that regard. They are basically street sellers and I think that's what Mr. Young is.

He certainly compares favorably in terms of conduct to Mr. Carrillo. He is similar to Mr. Carmichael. I know that the Second Circuit has cautioned District Courts not to calibrate sentences to co-defendants, but to the extent it's helpful to the Court, you know, Mr. Young sold a lot more to a confidential source. He sold 32 grams just to an undercover buys which alone would get him over the 28-gram threshold that we use to charge individuals over the five-year mandatory minimum. We did give me a zero to 20, I think that's in recognition to his minor role. He's not living the life that Mr. Carrillo was certainly. But when you're comparing him to other co-defendants who are like him, street sellers, he doesn't compare favorably not just in terms of volume but in terms of his record. I think only Mr. Williams has arguably a worse record.

What troubles us about Mr. Young is that he has a mix of violent criminal history, even though he's a bit older, he has more recent drug convictions. He's gotten lenient

2.

sentences for some of those convictions. He's gotten treatment, he's completed treatment and yet it hasn't really deterred him in any way. So I think for those reasons a sentence within the range of 77 to 96 months is appropriate.

THE COURT: I've considered all the factors under 3553(a) including the advisory guidelines as we have all agreed they should be viewed in this case, so I'm not really even looking at the technically correct guidelines. What I am wrestling with is the 77 to 96 range the least amount of time necessary to accomplish the purposes of 3553(a). It's a mitigating factor to me in looking at Mr. Young's history and characteristics that he just never had much going for him and I think in the environment he was growing up in there just weren't many ways for him to go.

I agree with Mr. Dinnerstein, I don't know whose idea it was to lock people in these mega projects and not realize what could result from that, but opportunity is not something that Mr. Young had. I also tend to agree with Mr. Dinnerstein that the worst of the criminal acts occurred when he was younger and presumably more reckless. But also the point I was trying to make in terms of evaluating the seriousness of the crime and the circumstances of the offense, is that participating as a street dealer in a case like this is, in fact, very serious and in some ways more serious than any of the things he did as a teenager.

I really appreciate the family support that he has and when I take that into account I have to think about what happens to all the families who he sells to, the family members who are addicted to these drugs, what happens to their families. And I think in terms of general deterrence, it's very important to send a message that you can't support yourself or your own children by selling poison to other people and their children.

In terms of specific deterrents, I think there is a need because, as I said, Mr. Young just hasn't had a lot going on for him. I don't know, as I sit here, where he's going to go when he gets out. But I think there's a real risk, based on his history and based on the magnitude of this crime, that he again searches for what to him may be the easiest way if not the only way.

Certainly even the middle or the high end of the adjusted guideline range that we discussed is not necessary here. What I'm struggling with is whether the 77 or something less than 77 might do it. What gives me pause on that question is that while he was much younger, I don't really understand how this happened, maybe you can explain it,

Mr. Dinnerstein, in paragraph 40 of the PSR when he was convicted for second degree assault during a felony he was sentenced to three years but he didn't get released to parole until 2009, so it looks like he did like five years.

1 How does that happen? 2 MR. DINNERSTEIN: My understanding, after speaking 3 with him, is that he was released in 2007. 4 THE COURT: I see. 5 MR. DINNERSTEIN: And not 2009. That's what he 6 says. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Does probation think maybe that's 8 an error? 9 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Let me look through my 10 records, Your Honor. 11 It doesn't look right that he's arrested THE COURT: 12 in 2004, he's sentenced in 2005, then he's paroled in 2009 on 13 a three-year sentence. Something doesn't fit there. 14 reason I'm looking at this because it doesn't look like he's 15 ever served more than three years, probably less than that. 16 MR. DINNERSTEIN: My understanding, Your Honor, if I 17 can try to explain this to you, is that he was released 18 originally in 2007. He was violated in 2009, apparently 19 for -- there was something going on in the housing projects at 20 that time that he's not supposed to return back to the housing 21 projects to live and he was -- he didn't have an address at 22 some point, so he was incarcerated again because he couldn't 23 provide the parole department with an address. And that 24 occurred a second time for basically the same thing. His 25 violations had to do with not being able to provide them with

an adequate address.

THE COURT: Right, he's got three violations from that conviction but when they put him back they didn't have him serve any more than a couple of months, two or three months.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: That's right. Then they toss him back out on the street and he's got to find a place to live.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I'm sorry, that is a typo. The date of release to parole should be June 4th, 2007.

THE COURT: Now it makes sense. It's good that we clarified that because it's one thing for me to look at somebody who served five years in jail and determine how much it takes to specifically deter him, and somebody who served a couple of years here, a couple of months there, it's very different going away for as long as Mr. Young is going to this time.

Well, in light of that and all the other considerations that I've articulated, I don't think it's necessary to be within the 77 to 96 month range. I think a sentence, given the nature of his history of 63 months is sufficient to accomplish all of the purposes of sentencing and that therefore will be my sentence. Sixty-three months custody. I will of course recommend that he be assigned to a facility as close to New York as possible. I will also impose

three years of supervised release, which will require him to comply with the order of forfeiture, which I think I signed.

MR. SPEKTOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He is not permitted to associate —— and this is a tough one, Mr. Young, you have to be very careful about this. You're not permitted to associate whether in person, mail, email, texting with anybody who is in any organized crime groups. I didn't hold this against him because it was only mentioned once in one of the convictions that at some point they identified him with a street gang. You're not allowed to have any contact with anybody in that gang. Probation is going to give you a list of people you can't have contact with and you've got to stick to that or it's a violation and a violation here is different than the violations you may have experienced from your state court convictions, it can mean years in jail not a couple of months.

Now, in addition, I want him to participate in out-patient drug treatment as prescribed by probation. He's got to pay for that to the extent he can. If he can't, which I expect he can't then he doesn't have to. He's got to stay completely beyond sober. He's not allowed to have any alcohol or any other illegal drug or intoxicant unless it's pursuant to a doctor's prescription. And he's going to be randomly tested. They're going to show up at your house and they're say give us a urine sample. Again, if you fail it could be

years.

2.

In addition, when he gets out for a period of six months as a condition of his supervised release he'll be on curfew from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. electronic monitoring which he'll pay for if he can and he won't if he can't.

And then I'm also going to impose a search condition, which means, Mr. Young, that if the Probation Department has a reasonable suspicion that you're possessing contraband or engaged in illegal activity, they can enter your house, even if it is not your house, any place you're living, any car you have access to, any place you have access to, to do a search to see if you are violating any laws. And they'll have to conduct that search in a reasonable time, place and manner.

I'm not going to impose a fine because I know he can't afford it. I will impose a 100-dollar special assessment.

Anything further before I advise him of his appellate rights which I assume were waived in the plea agreement.

MR. SPEKTOR: They were waived, Your Honor. Just one thing for the record, the matter of separation which was bought up at the last sentencing. As Your Honor directed, we did contact the BOP, we've asked them to expedite the designation and they said they'll do that as long as we

1 forward the judgment, which we have already for the prior two 2. cases and we'll do that for this one as well. 3 THE COURT: Great. That also reminds me, any open 4 counts? 5 There are no open counts at this time. MR. SPEKTOR: 6 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your Honor, there is one other 7 matter I would ask you to consider and that is also inpatient 8 drug program at the facility that he gets sent to. I don't 9 think you can order it but I think you can make an 10 recommendation. 11 THE COURT: I actually think I can order it. Do the 12 parties think I can't order it? I think what I can't do is 13 leave it to probation to determine whether it's inpatient or 14 out-patient, but I can order inpatient treatment and certainly 1.5 if he's asking for it I can order it. 16 MR. DINNERSTEIN: He is asking for it. 17 THE COURT: What does probation think about that? 18 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I believe you 19 can order it, yes, that's correct, while he's in custody. 20 THE COURT: I will modify the drug treatment that 21 I've conditioned as part of supervised release to require 22 inpatient drug treatment at a program to be selected by 23 probation and I will also recommend to the BOP that he have 24 the RDAP or whatever the equivalent maximum program is while

All

he's in custody, so hopefully that will do some good.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

s/ Georgette K. Betts January 25, 2018

GEORGETTE K. BETTS DATE

23

24